DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 054 142 TE 002 444

AUTHOR	Wood, Gordon R.
TITLE	Questionable White Dialects: If Questionable, What Then?
PUB DATE	Nov 70
NOTE	21p.; Speech given at the Annual Convention of the National Council of Teachers of English (60th, Atlanta, November 1970)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	*American English, *Linguistics, *Nonstandard Dialects, *Pronunciation, *Regional Dialects

ABSTRACT

Questionable white dialects are discussed from the viewpoints of various authorities, and the dialects of the Southern states are used as examples of the complexity associated with attempting to designate a set of usages as being questionable. Suggestions of ways in which English teachers may cope with the problem of dialects and jargons are given. (DB)

ED054142

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

Questionable White Dialects: If Questionable, What Then?

Gordon R. Wood

A common experience, as cigarette advertisements tell us, is to link dialect variations with bad grammar. In practice we insist that some white dialects are acceptable and that others are questionable without paying too much attention to the grounds for judgment. For over two hundred years the fortunate few have tried to change or ignore the practices of the unfortunate many. From grammar books alone it is obvious that year after year some people have continued to use questionable choices in pronunciation or usage and that others have tried to change that kind of choice. Teachers, for example, have sought to influence their students as is shown from this, the thirty ninth entry in a questionnaire:

> In giving a talk on tennis, a high school student in Southern Illinois used the pronunciation tinnis. He was told that regional pronunciations would not be accepted in the English class. More teachers should use this same method.[1]

Other persons who get their opinions published have joined their friends in condemning a word like enthuse, saying in concert "By God, let's hold the line on this one." And still others do as T. S. Eliot did. Born in St. Louis, he rejected his native midwestern dialect and, moving to England, tried to talk like a member of the fox hunting gentry.

Common experience also reminds us that many attempts to move from one dialect to another are not always successful. The British gentry may not have laughed openly when Eliot tried out his new Anglicized speech; on the other hand, Robert Frost commented sourly on it as an

TE 002 444

affectation. In the United States if the young man who said tinnis had learned the regional usages of northern Illinois and had then returned home, his neighbors and kin there would have asked where he got that terrible midwestern accent. As for persons hired by a dictionary to pass judgments on such words as enthuse, the editorial introduction to their work reads like an ironic dismissal of their bought judgments.[2]

The urge to correct sometimes is balanced by an urge to accept, sometimes not. In passing judgment on the thirty ninth entry of the questionnaire, for example, many persons disapproved of efforts to change the pronunciation of tennis. At least half of the college students who responded, half of the college graduates in English, half of the teachers of English, and all of the linguists voted against the idea that a teacher should chide students for their regionalisms.[3] In doing so they seem to share an idea that usefulness of choice is governed by time, place, and circumstances -- an idea that is carefully stated in John S. Kenyon's 1948 article on cultural levels and functional varities of English.[4] To put it bluntly, leave your language alone, a phrase that served as first title of a supercilious book on linguistics and teaching English.

This balance between accepting and correcting is reflected year after year in departmental meetings, at annual conventions, and throughout the professional journals. Indeed, the amateur public is happy to offer its suggestions about ways to improve reading and writing in the schools. When someone wants spelling reform, he can will a large sum of money for that prupose. Someone else can offer instruction in speed reading. And still a third can suggest revisions in the general design of the language. For an example of this last sort, anyone can turn to B. F. Skinner for a blueprint:

> Under the conditions of an ideal language, the word for <u>house</u> for example, would be composed of elements referring to color, style, material, size, position, and so on . . . Every word in such a language would be a proper noun, referring to a single thing or event. Anyone who spoke the language could immediately invent the word for a new situation by putting together the basic responses separately related to its elements.[5]

Every word without exception must be a true noun and not a pseudo-one; at least that is what I think he means by <u>proper</u>. Each noun will be put together helter skelter with self translating parts linked in no discernible order. Since it can be spoken its form will be that of a chain; if written, it would be linked up and down as well as lengthwise to form chain mail. And the noun language would be right in its design.

But back to the matter of questionable white dialects. One difficult problem is to get at what is questionable. Is American English, <u>i.e.</u> the entire national dialect, questionable in its vocabulary, pronunciation, and syntax? Within the national boundaries, is one or other dialect acceptable in all of its details while all other dialects are inferior at most points? Here, of course, a further distinction must be made between social dialects in a locality and the regional dialects Northern, Midland, and Southern in which those social variations appear. Or are the questionable elements those interpretations of evidence which lead to the conclusion that there are three major dialects in the Atlantic states and that their distinctive traits can be traced westward across the nation until they touch the Pacific?

My discussion of some of these questionablenesses will focus on the

Southern states which were settled after 1800, excluding Kentucky, Missouri, and Texas, but including Oklahoma.[6] For the states of Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Oklahoma, and Mississippi let me shock some sensibilities by claiming that there is no Southern dialect of American English in most of them. This statement seems to contradict what appears on the record jacket of Americans Speaking, a recording and pamphlet brought out under the auspices of the National Council of the Teachers of English. On that jacket is a map of the United States showing the three dialect areas of the Atlantic states and their presumed western extensions into areas settled after the Revolution. Furthermore, the localities are shown of the persons whose recordings accompany the jacket text. Three are in the original thirteen states; the other three further west. It is said of these six persons "All speakers recorded represent the cultivated speech of their areas . . .; no speaker exhibited pronunciation features widely regarded as substandard in his own area" [italics mine]. As for the specific dialect which the cultivated speech of each person illustrates, "the evidence suggests that the three principal dialect regions extend west of the Alleghenies and even beyond the Mississippi, with clearly marked subareas."[7] Existing evidence does not fully support that interpretation.

At this point it is necessary to remind ourselves that "Southern" as marked by the political boundary of the Confederacy differs from "Southern" as a dialect area. Southern dialect as used here was defined by Kurath in terms of regionally selected words; adjacent to it was the Midland dialect; and the common boundary between Midland and Southern words was drawn along the crest of the Blue Ridge from Virginia into northern counties of South Carolina.[8] Linguistic Atlas plans provided for later studies

of these same words west and south of the original thirteen colonies. For the seaboard states of the Confederacy this means among other things that the Southern dialect occurs in the tidewater and piedmont while the Midland dialect occurs in the mountains. Later the Atlas records furnished information of verb forms and on pronunciation which became the bases of two publications. Verb variations were published first and then the record of individual pronunciations of stressed vowels and diphthongs.[9] The maps of the latter were superimposed on the maps established by the general vocabulary; but these superimposed boundaries do not seem to me to match very well in the Atlantic states. Furthermore it is not equally clear in the separate studies what usages are associated with the first families and what with white trash, and yet these matters as we have seen are always important when we judge whether a choice is proper or questionable.

The jacket map of Americans Speaking illustrates our problem in matching new evidence with old. The recorded speakers are placed on it within the boundaries of the original dialects and their assumed westward extensions. For Midland, one representative speaker came from Philadelphia; the other from London, Kentucky. It seems unlikely that there is a sufficient body of evidence to support a claim that dialectal traits in vocabulary, pronunciation, and syntax of Philadelphia are reproduced in any but the most superficial way in the Kentucky informant's speech. For the Southern dialect there is one representative at Prattville, Alabama, a region settled after the American Revolution; there is no representative from the colonial settlement areas in tidewater Virginia or the Carolina low country. Again it seems to me that it is dangerous to assume that a secondary settlement pattern reflects mainly those features found in the

original settlements -- at least enough of them to make a true match. Anyone can test the Midland evidence by listening to two recorded voices, but no one can make a similar test for Southern. Further, since there are no instances anywhere of the performance of substandard speakers, we cannot discover here the ranges between acceptable and questionable within or across dialects. Taking this recording as a model of the whole state of knowledge, we must acknowledge that our information about the white dialects makes it difficult to mark the gradations of acceptability at any point within a dialect area or in a string of points extending from the Atlantic seaboard to the Mississippi River. Beyond that, so far as the map above provides a guide, is terra incognita.

What are some facts of usage for those parts of the republic which were settled during the nineteenth century? Specific answers will appear when linguistic Atlas studies of the midwest and the Dictionary of American Regional English are published within the next few years. New evidence for some one thousand regional words in the South is now in print.[10] From this latter body of evidence it is clear that the dialect patterns in the former Confederacy are complex. Using Kurath's test words for Southern dialect, one can draw its westward boundary in west Georgia. Or using other test words and Atwood's investigation of Texas vocabulary, Southern "finally comes to an end somewhere on the slopes of the southern Rockies".[11]

Without attempting to attach labels such as urban-rural, elegant-crude, or new-current-obsolete to these examples, let us see how Kurath, Atwood, and I use a common set of words to reach such a paradoxical conclusion about the Southern dialect. Three of Kurath's indications of Southern dialect are mosquito hawk, one of several synonyms for a dragon

fly, spider, referring to a skillet or frying pan, and press peach, a peach of a certain kind. When the western occurrences of these words are mapped, the line marking their outer limits follows the Chattahoochee River from the Georgia mountains southwest to the western border of that state and then south to the Gulf of Mexico. This line can be connected at its upper end with the Midland-Southern boundary which Kurath drew into the mountains of South Carolina. Thus the western limit of that Southern dialect is in Georgia. That leaves north Georgia, south Florida, and all of Tennessee, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, Arkansas, Oklahoma, and Texas usages as part of the Midland dialect or, to switch technical labels and analytical assumptions, as a part of General American.

But we have already seen that Atwood thought that the Southern dialect extended as far west as the Rockies. His conclusions require a different but equally proper set of test words -- light bread, snap beans, and croker sack. Their mapping gives quite a different picture. From local reports it is clear that they occur (or are known) generally; their northern border is set at the northern political boundaries of Tennessee, Arkansas, and Oklahoma. Using this evidence as a guide one would be forced to conclude that the Southern dialect covers all the states of the Confederacy that were settled after 1800 and extends west of them. How far north into Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, and so on this Southern dialect extends was not a part of these investigations.[12]

If the dialect in part of the South is questionably Southern, then is the vocabulary certainly Midland everywhere but in parts of Georgia and Florida? No. In the mountains, as one might expect, the features called Midland and South Midland appear, and so do features called Northern. Their drift elsewhere appears to have been guided by the movement

of people and supplies along the rivers. But at other times a delay in settlement seems to have erected a dam against the further westward spread of some representative words. The Midland words comfort, meaning a quilt, and dog irons, a synonym of andirons have entered the Southern dialect in Georgia as part of a wide band which extends from Tennessee south to the Gulf of Mexico in west Florida. On the other hand numerous Midland and a few Southern words have not been reported west of the Oklahoma-Arkansas state line. Still others -- snake doctor and dog irons, for example -- extend west into the Oklahoma panhandle.[13]

At least one other element distinguishes some local usages in a part of the South. It is the presence of French words which are to be traced to the probable influence of Louisiana French. Bayou as a name for a kind of stream is certain. It is a new world French word which is a corruption of an American Indian word; English speaking pioneer settlers in the Mississippi Valley could hardly have learned it from print and so the places called bayou have the ghost of a speaker of French lurking nearby. Armoire has a similar distribution in the Mississippi Valley as a name for a piece of furniture, though armor may be what is said by those who own one. The -oire variation could have been learned from catalogs or other commercial sources. But that would not account for the presence or absence in patterns of geographic distribution that resemble those of bayou. Two examples are scarcely sufficient for proof, but they do suggest that the influence of local French on regional vocabulary needs further exploration.

Thus questionableness of choice must first be related to the actual presence of a vocabulary which permits one to choose.

The label "questionable white dialect" may have less to do with the geography of competing synonyms than it does with attitudes toward some

group that uses it. To choose a national illustration, skill, gave way to know how which has in turn given way to expertise. For some people these changes are good. Others have criticized the corruption of our native tongue by business men, government, Madison Avenue, or some other wicked group in power. And this contest between the Saxonists and the Latinists over improprieties can be traced back to the fifteenth century if not earlier. Furthermore, what "the enlightened judgments of a cultivated elite" may be at a given moment will not necessarily reflect their actual performance in using a Romance word when a Saxon one should be judged the better.

Community attitudes have to be guessed if one is collecting responses by means of a questionnaire. To be sure, someone would occasionally write in the margin that armoire is old fashioned or that coal oil is the usual name even though everyone knows that kerosene is correct. It is reasonable to assume that, if a word is selected by those in their seventies and eighties but not by the rest of the community, the word is obsolescent. At times a general knowledge of human conduct makes it safe to guess at a history of use. Golf and marbles are two games, the first having a standard vocabulary which is learned from a book either directly or indirectly. The vocabulary of marbles, on the other hand, passes by word of mouth from one generation of boys to the next. For each boy and perhaps for a very few girls, there is the stage when a player learns the new words, uses them actively for a few years, and then stores them somewhere in the back parts of memory. The questionnaire that uses game words does not show this process. But the responses from the eight Southern states show that the main words transmitted by word of mouth are taw and taw line; lag line, lagging line, and starting line are rarer; and up to scratch, if it is viewed

as a marble usage at all, was not volunteered. In north Georgia, north Florida, and north Arkansas the preferred term is taw line if memory served the informants well; in the other parts of this region it is taw.[14]

In some particulars community opinion cannot often be trusted. Witness what has happened to poke as a name for containers and tote as a term for transporting something. One could talk about not buying a pig in a poke without endangering his social standing; the word was part of a suitable proverb. But outside of that setting, anyone who aspired to elegance would choose sack or bag as the correct word. Questionnaire evidence suggests the probable presence of that scale of values in the interior parts of the South. Yet it may come as a surprise to many persons in that region that a new published arbiter of elegance labels it chiefly regional; we assume that within the region poke is now at the same social level as are its synonyms. But whether this is a gain over an earlier arbiter's label now chiefly dialectal is not clear.[15]

Tote is a more fully documented instance. In the questionnaire its synonyms were listed as carry, freight, hike, lug, and pack, and as carrying, hauling, hauling and teaming. In the responses of slightly over one thousand Southerners, none marked freight, 1 chose teaming, and 4 hike. The totals for the other words are these in increasing order: 17 drawing, 22 carting, 40 pack, 184 lug, 858 carry(ing) and 989 hauling. Tote and toting come to 286 or somewhat more than one fourth of the maximum possible responses. The bulk of citations in the American Dialect Dictionary (1944) come from Southern records. But in 1941 a national newsmagazine discovered the word and used it at least once a month for the next year or so. The admired Webster II classified it as Southern U. S. and cited the phrase "To tote a horse to water."[16] Surely the dictionary makers must have

here been victims of an elaborate joke which begins with Yankee objections to carry in the construction "I'll carry you back to Virginny". If they substitute the unesteemed tote for it and replace the Yankee take in the proverbial sentence you can take a horse, the resultant happening is that you can tote a horse to water and so on. But possibly tote has been completely rehabilitated in the meantime, for women's fashions have named a container a tote bag. If tote does rise to national esteem in its own right, it will provide an instance that women set the pace in producing language change.[17] Questionable, then, is linked to time, place, and circumstance as we all should know.

The dialects of American English have been identified by means of pronunciational tests or, as here, by the presence or absence selected words and short phrases. Other kinds of language patterns exist which must be mentioned because they color our impressions of acceptability.

When we turn to examples of continous discourse, we find that almost everything is questionable. If descriptive linguistics is correct in its contention that every language is unique and should be described in its own terms, then each identifiable dialect of that language should have some unique features of its own. Let us assume for instance that the intonation patterns of Northern differ from those of Midland and both differ from those of Southern. Where are the spectrograms and the tape recorded evidence that illustrate these variations? Or if it is a matter of syntactic design, where are the presentations and interpretations of that material? We can say from statistical studies of current prose that the design of scientific writing differs in some particulars from that of other kinds of writing. But we would be hard put to find evidence that will enable us to say how the ordering of continuous speech in any dialect

area resembles or differs from that of other areas and from its printed counterparts.

The difficulty of deciding what is acceptable or what is questionable can be illustrated from a part of different responses to a picture which originally was drawn for Mexican informants rather than as an indication of crime in the streets. The picture is numbered 8086 --

> Eight oh eighty six / well there's a desperado there / he's a robber / he's got his face masked / got the gun in his hand / got the guy by the throat and there's this black car there ready to take off.
>
> Eight oh eight six / this is a bandit holding someone up.
>
> Eighty eighty six / a holdup / and man with a handkerchief over his face and he has a pistol in his hand / his hand is on the other man's throat / and a car is waiting to speed him away.
>
> Number eight thousand eight six / holdup / a robber is either holding up a man or getting ready to kill him because he wouldn't give him his money / on the street at night / with a mask over his face / he's going to hit him over the head with a pistol.[18]

In a matter no more complex than counting units beyond one hundred, the patterns of choice vary. From the examples above it is also evident that differing patterns are used to convey the same information. But it is not clear whether got a gun in his hand and its parallal with a mask over his face are personal idiosyncracies, regional variations with social overtones, or indications of dialectal clues which are to be interpreted as Northern, Midland, or Southern. At the moment the best one can do is identify revolver as an Americanism, note that its frequency of spontaneous

occurrence in the evidence studied is lower than that of pistol and gun, and note further that in the dialect of law enforcement one of the professional terms is hand gun. By means of computer techniques it may be possible in the future to differentiate among varieties of spoken English in ways similar to those for written English. At the moment that work has just begun. But what emerges may be of no more help in identifying "questionable" than have been the details already noted here.

The burden of these paragraphs has been that atlases of word distribution are reference tools which must be used with care when anyone attempts to discover the questionableness of a set of usages. Do the dictionaries serve us better in deciding these matters for us? So far as pronunciation goes, the placing of one transcription in a string of other pronunciations is simply a requirement of printing. If the first is assumed to be prestigious, then the rest are assumed to be less so though the degree of decline is not given; on the other hand, if the first is lowest, the ascent goes toward the last. And none can be so detailed as Kenyon's scholarly American Pronunciation (1950) for example.

If there are panels of authorities who vote on pronunciation, their effort is not so fully described as is the work of a panel who voted on the acceptability of questionable constructions. As a result of their balloting, we are told, "the ordinary user, looking up an expression whose social status is uncertain, can discover just how and to what extent his presumed betters agree on what he ought to say or write."[19] Ninety percent of this elite voted that finalize was unacceptable but apparently did not choose to vote on realize and idealize. But the ordinary user who tips his hat when the gentry pass by must be puzzled by the actions of ten percent whose vote

is unknown. Did they vote for or abstain? If the ten percent was entirely blue blood and the other ninety a rising, uncertain middle class, then the judgment of aristocrats should count for much more than those from lower classes. On the panel were professors, public officials, and authors who have "a recognized ability to speak and write good English."[20] Public officials and professors have provided examples of questionable usage, but the most distinguished source of errors from Shakespeare's day to this has been the writer. The drift of condemnation is illustrated in this comment from Woolley's Handbook (1908): "The word 'vim' can be found in the works of Stevenson, but it is nevertheless bad English."[21] Present writers can hardly be expected to perform better than their illustrious predecessors. In fact, some of their works are better examples of mannerisms than of manners.

What is the English teacher to do under these circumstances when he knows that there are local Gileadies waiting to destroy Ephraimites who use the questionable sibboleth rather than the acceptable shibboleth? A useful starting point is for teachers to make a private inventory of their own dialects and jargons, and then to attempt to get their students to observe and report the community standards for functional levels and cultural varieties of English. The Kenyon article already mentioned could provide a kind of scale or graph for plotting some values.

Pronunciation is the most difficult to plot on such a scale. Yet even the youngest school children have developed a sense of local values. Since the record American Speaking does have six examples, each from a different part of the eastern half of the United States, it could be used in making the school judgments more explicit. After the group has listened to the recording, each member would be asked to mark his private

valuation when the record is replayed. Each of the six speakers would be rated on a scale which contained graduated lines which would read from left to right in contrasting pairs refined--unrefined, clear--slovenly, and so on. A range of class judgments could then be compiled and interpreted from the students' papers. The more mature students might be asked to identify the specific sounds which they consider refined or crude. A possible by-product of this listening and judging may be that students will see the connection between some spellings and particular pronunciations: take it for granite rather than take it for granted, and crayfish rather than the French crevice.

Problems of questionable grammar and syntax have ordinarily been examined word at a time. Dived or dove. The appropriate preposition for sick at, sick to, or sick on one's stomach. The specific verb shall or will: "In the first person, shall has . . . been the normal auxiliary for expressing mere futurity," a British rule which indicates that all the rest of the English speaking world reverses the choice and is wrong.[23] And the correct choice of me which leads to the hyperurban between you and I. Structural grammars by their basic assumptions can lead mainly to descriptions of sentences; relative acceptability is left to the judgment of the speaker and his peers. Transformational-generative grammars seem to promise the means for producing all and only grammatical sentences. But grammatical does not mean mannerly. Those who work with this sort of grammar know that it can produce the questionable them lights is all wrong as readily as it produces those traffic signals are flashing incorrectly.

Grammatical studies, however, can show how the patterns of questionable usages have some kind of parallel among accepted ones. That is, they can

serve to show that a dialect has its systems. The construction the beauty thing, which I first heard in the South, can be interpreted as an echo of the very thing, the only thing, the shiny thing, and so on. Or it may be considered as one possible transformation of beauty is a thing, a thing of beauty, or a thing has beauty. If neither of these quite satisfies us, then it may be viewed as a string of names held loosely together in the fashion of steel gate post and fun house. It may be interesting to see whether fun party and fun game have escaped from advertisements and have become a part of community usage.

Verbs seem to furnish a greater number of puzzles than do nouns. Consider, for instance, the placing of on in connection with work. In some instances two placement rules overlap and the result is a platform on which to work on. Placing of on and similar words is related to their inclusion or exclusion at a particular moment. In some communities of the South and presumably elsewhere the words I felt of it seem to be equivalent to I felt it; there may be a distinction in meaning that is roughly equivalent to that which sets apart they heard it or they learned it from they heard of it and they learned of it. Other complicated rules govern the forming of full verbs. Had wended, somewhat archaic, is very much alive in the nationally questionable had went just as the childish had sended is reduced to the adult had sent. A difficulty of this sort should be balanced against a pattern in which adult practice is uniform. When a main verb ends in -ing, everyone agrees on the small list of forms that can go before it and in what order. Is + working can be easily expanded to should + have + been + kept + working.

Other combinations of verb elements suggest the presence of alternate sets of rules. There are rules which prohibit shall shall it or might

might it while permitting will will it, had had it, did do it and the like. In some communities an elite may give preference to might could over might be able; in other places might could is viewed as improper and ungrammatical. Everywhere in the nation did do it is placed on a socially higher scale than done done it.

These variations can be plotted on a grid of local values. Their structures can be reported by the procedures which descriptive linguists use. And each variable can be generated by means of generative-transformational grammars. Doing these several things in class does cast light on the system of language and on local attitudes toward some elements. By necessity much of this observation occurs because of the accident of course organization, text structure, and student response. One result is that neither students nor teachers find much system in the catch-as-catch can observations.

A more systematic approach to scaling these variables is hinted at in some of the new research. A single usage is put into settings which cause it to be at various points in the scale of accepted-questioned-rejected judgments. The class marks its individual views for each sentence; i.e., assumes that the disputed usage is whether we include or reject she was or they were in these circumstances:

> Sophia Loren was seen by the people while enjoying herself
>
> The people saw Sophia Loren while enjoying themselves.
>
> Judy was seen by the people while enjouing themselves.
>
> The people saw Karen while enjoying herself[23]

The tabulated preferences will perhaps show that if a person has marked the last sentence as acceptable (active forms in this instance), he will accept not only the other active pattern but the two passives as well. So far as I know, this attempt to establish a graded scale of predictable community responses is in its research infancy. The research procedure looks interesting. In class use it may prove to be a valuable change from more traditional forms of exercises. But much more inquiry must take place before the results of this research can be closely matched with the concepts of questionable usage which have been reported here.

Southern Illinois University

Edwardsville, Illinois 62025

8 October 1970

For presentation at the 60th Annual Meeting, National Council of Teachers of English, Atlanta, Georgia, November 26-28, 1970

Notes

1. Ellen A. Frogner, "A Study of the Responses to the Language Inquiry," Interim Report, Illinois State-Wide Curriculum Study Center in the Preparation of Secondary School English Teachers, 1969, (USOE Project HE-145) p. 39.

2. The American Heritage Dictionary of The English Language (New York, 1969), pp. xxi-xxiv.

3. Frogner (1969), pp. 8, 52-66.

4. "Cultural Levels and Functional Varieties of English," College English, 10 (1948), 31-36.

5. B. F. Skinner, "The Problem of Reference," reprinted in Psycholinguistics: A Book of Readings (New York, 1961), pp. 234-5.

6. Vocabulary details for these eight states appear in Gordon R. Wood, Vocabulary Change: A Study of Variation in Regional Words in Eight of the Southern States (Carbondale and Edwardsville: Southern Illinois University Press, 1971) and for selected words, pronunciations, and syntactical units in Wood, Sub-Regional Speech Variations in Vocabulary, Grammar, and Pronunciation (photo offset, Southern Illinois University, Edwardsville, 1967) available as Document ED 019 263, ERIC Document Reproduction Service.

7. Raven I. McDavid, Jr. "Record Notes" on record jacket for A Dialect Recording Prepared by John T. Muri and Raven I. McDavid, Jr. for the National Council of Teachers of English (Champaign, Illinois: 1967).

8. Hans Kurath, A Word Geography of the Eastern United States (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1949); other scholars prefer the labels Northern, General American, and Southern. In this classification the descriptions of Southern and General American are not very helpful within the states that I have studied and reported (Wood 1967, 1971).

9. E. Bagby Atwood, A Survey of Verb Forms in the Eastern United States (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1953); Hans Kurath and Raven I. McDavid, Jr., The Pronunciation of English in the Atlantic States (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1961).

10. Wood (1971). For Texas see E. Bagby Atwood, The Regional Vocabulary of Texas (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1962).

11. Atwood (1962), p. 87.

12. A convenient summary map of northern limits of corn shuck and corn pone in Ohio, Indiana, and Illinois is in Carroll E. Reed, Dialects of American English (Cleveland and New York, 1967), Map 14, p. 98.

13. See Wood (1971), "Word Index".

14. Ibid.

15. See poke in Webster's New International Dictionary (1920) and American Heritage Dictionary (1969). The Random House Dictionary of the English Language (1967) labels it Midland U. S. and Scots.

16. Definition 3, transitive verb, in Webster (1920) has the labels Dialectal and Southern U. S.

17. A lighthearted discussion of this point is Roger W. Shuy's "Sex as a Factor in Sociolinguistic Research," (mimeo) Center for Applied Linguistics, 1969.

18. Transcribed from the tapes discussed and used in Wood (1967).

19. American Heritage Dictionary (1969), pp. xxiii - iv.

20. Ibid.

21. Edwin C. Woolley, Handbook of Composition: A Compendium of Rules Regarding Good English, Grammar, Sentence Structure, Paragraphing, Manuscript Arrangement, Punctuation, Spelling, Essay Writing, and Letter Writing (Boston: D. C. Heath, 1908).

22. Definition, shall, Oxford English Dictionary, continues "To use will in these cases is now a mark of Scottish, Irish provincial, or extra-British idiom."

23. Dale Elliott, Stanley Legum, Sandra Annear Thompson, "Syntactic Variation as Linguistic Data," (mimeo): later it appeared in Papers from the Fifth Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society (Chicago: 1969).

Charles-James N. Bailey has contributed papers to this discussion. His test on restrictions connected with know and like is of considerable interest as an example of procedure. See his preliminary "Note" in Working Papers in Linguistics (Hawaii: Department of Linguistics, University of Hawaii) Issue 10 (November, 1969), pp. xxiii - iv.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY GORDON R. WOOD

TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER."